

(Yankee) tendered for filing, a revised decommissioning cost estimate and funding schedule for Yankee's nuclear generating plant.

Yankee states that the rate change proposed would, as a result, of an increase in decommissioning charges, increase Yankee's rates by \$30.2 million annually.

Yankee states that copies of its filing have been provided to its wholesale customers and to state regulatory commissions in Connecticut, Vermont, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Maine and Rhode Island.

Comment date: April 21, 1995, in accordance with Standard Paragraph E at the end of this notice.

23. Maine Public Service Co.

[Docket No. ER95-836-000]

Take notice that on March 31, 1995, Maine Public Service Company tendered for filing an initial rate schedule a Transmission Service and Ancillary Services Tariff.

Comment date: April 21, 1995, in accordance with Standard Paragraph E at the end of this notice.

24. Charles W. Wells

[Docket No. ID-2435-001]

Take notice that on March 24, 1995, Charles W. Wells (Applicant) tendered for filing an application under Section 305(b) of the Federal Power Act to hold the following positions:

Director: Illinova Corporation
Director and Officer: Illinois Power Company
Director: First of America Bank-Illinois, N.A.

Comment date: April 21, 1995, in accordance with Standard Paragraph E at the end of this notice.

Standard Paragraphs

E. Any person desiring to be heard or to protest said filing should file a motion to intervene or protest with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 825 North Capitol Street, NE., Washington, DC 20426, in accordance with Rules 211 and 214 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (18 CFR 385.211 and 18 CFR 385.214). All such motions or protests should be filed on or before the comment date. Protests will be considered by the Commission in determining the appropriate action to be taken, but will not serve to make protestants parties to the proceeding. Any person wishing to become a party must file a motion to intervene. Copies of this filing are on file with the

Commission and are available for public inspection.

Lois D. Cashell,
Secretary.

[FR Doc. 95-9201 Filed 4-13-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-P

[Project 2442-001 New York]

City of Watertown; Notice of Availability of Draft Environmental Assessment

April 10, 1995.

In accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 and the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission's (Commission's) Regulations, 18 CFR Part 380 (Order No. 486, 52 FR 47897), the Office of Hydropower Licensing has reviewed the application for major new license for the proposed Watertown Project, located in Jefferson County and has prepared a Draft Environmental Assessment (DEA) for the project. In the DEA, the Commission's staff has analyzed the potential environmental impacts of the proposed project and has concluded that approval of the project, with appropriate mitigation or enhancement measures, would not constitute a major federal action significantly affecting the quality of the human environment.

Copies of the DEA are available for review in the Public Reference Branch, Room 3104, of the Commission's offices at 941 North Capitol Street N.E., Washington, D.C. 20426.

Please submit any comments within 30 days from the date of this notice and should be addressed to Lois D. Cashell, Secretary, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 825 North Capitol Street N.E., Washington, D.C. 20426. Please affix Project No. 2442-001 to all comments. For further information, please contact Peter Leitzke, Environmental Coordinator, at (202) 219-2803.

Linwood A. Watson, Jr.,

Acting Secretary.

[FR Doc. 95-9200 Filed 4-13-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6717-01-M

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

[FRL-5191-4]

Agency Information Collection Activities Under OMB Review

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: In compliance with the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*), this notice announces that the Information Collection Request (ICR) abstracted below has been forwarded to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review and comment. The ICR describes the nature of the information collection and its expected cost and burden.

DATES: Comments must be submitted on or before May 15, 1995.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION OR A COPY CALL: Sandy Farmer at EPA, (202) 260-2740, please refer to ICR #0794.07.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Office of Prevention, Pesticides and Toxic Substances

Title: Notification of Substantial Risks Under Section 8 of the Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA). (EPA ICR No. 0794.07; OMB No. 2070-0046).

Abstract: Under Section 8(e) of TSCA, chemical manufacturers, importers, processors, and distributors must immediately inform EPA when they obtain information which indicates that their product(s) may present a substantial risk of injury to health or the environment. Section 8(e) of TSCA is an important and useful tool for early warning and the identification of new substantial risks posed by exposure to chemical substances. The EPA and other Federal agencies use this information to determine and control chemical risks.

Burden Statement: Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 21 hours per initial Section 8(e) submission and 4 hours per follow-up/supplemental Section 8(e) submission. EPA experience has shown that approximately 2.2 follow-up/supplemental Section 8(e) submissions are received on a yearly basis per initial submission. This estimate includes the time needed to review instructions, gather and submit the data needed, and complete and review the collection of information.

Respondents: Chemical manufacturers, importers, processors, and distributors.

Estimated Number of Respondents: 1440.

Frequency of Collection: On Occasion.
Estimated Number of Responses per Respondent: 3.

Estimated Total Annual Burden on Respondents: 13,400 hours.

Send comments regarding the burden estimate, or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing the burden, (please refer to EPA ICR #794.07 and OMB #2070-0046) to:

Sandy Farmer, USEPA ICR #0794.07,
U.S. Environmental Protection
Agency, Information Policy Branch
(2316), 401 M Street SW.,
Washington, DC 20460

and

Timothy Hunt, OMB #2070-0046, Office
of Management and Budget, Office of
Information and Regulatory Affairs,
725 17th Street NW., Washington, DC
20503.

Dated: April 7, 1995.

Richard Westlund,

*Acting Director, Regulatory Information
Division.*

[FR Doc. 95-9249 Filed 4-13-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-M

[ER-FRL-4722-2]

Environmental Impact Statements and Regulations; Availability of EPA Comments

Availability of EPA comments prepared March 13, 1995 through March 17, 1995 pursuant to the Environmental Review Process (ERP), under Section 309 of the Clean Air Act and Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act as amended. Requests for copies of EPA comments can be directed to the Office of Federal Activities at (202) 260-5076.

Summary of Rating Definitions

Environmental Impact of the Action

LO—Lack of Objections

The EPA review has not identified any potential environmental impacts requiring substantive changes to the proposal. The review may have disclosed opportunities for application of mitigation measures that could be accomplished with no more than minor changes to the proposal.

EC—Environmental Concerns

The EPA review has identified environmental impacts that should be avoided in order to fully protect the environment. Corrective measures may require changes to the preferred alternative or application of mitigation measures that can reduce the environmental impact. EPA would like to work with the lead agency to reduce these impacts.

EO—Environmental Objections

The EPA review has identified significant environmental impacts that must be avoided in order to provide adequate protection for the

environment. Corrective measures may require substantial changes to the preferred alternative or consideration of some other project alternative (including the no action alternative or a new alternative). EPA intends to work with the lead agency to reduce these impacts.

EU—Environmentally Unsatisfactory

The EPA review has identified adverse environmental impacts that are of sufficient magnitude that they are unsatisfactory from the standpoint of public health or welfare or environmental quality. EPA intends to work with the lead agency to reduce these impacts. If the potentially unsatisfactory impacts are not corrected at the final EIS stage, this proposal will be recommended for referral to the CEQ.

Adequacy of the Impact Statement

Category 1—Adequate

EPA believes the draft EIS adequately sets forth the environmental impact(s) of the preferred alternative and those of the alternatives reasonably available to the project or action. No further analysis or data collection is necessary, but the reviewer may suggest the addition of clarifying language or information.

Category 2—Insufficient Information

The draft EIS does not contain sufficient information for EPA to fully assess environmental impacts that should be avoided in order to fully protect the environment, or the EPA reviewer has identified new reasonably available alternatives that are within the spectrum of alternatives analyzed in the draft EIS, which could reduce the environmental impacts of the action. The identified additional information, data, analyses, or discussion should be included in the final EIS.

Category 3—Inadequate

EPA does not believe that the draft EIS adequately assesses potentially significant environmental impacts of the action, or the EPA reviewer has identified new, reasonably available alternatives that are outside of the spectrum of alternatives analyzed in the draft EIS, which should be analyzed in order to reduce the potentially significant environmental impacts. EPA believes that the identified additional information, data, analyses, or discussions are of such a magnitude that they should have full public review at a draft stage. EPA does not believe that the draft EIS is adequate for the purposes of the NEPA and/or Section 309 review, and thus should be formally revised and made available for public comment in a supplemental or revised

draft EIS. On the basis of the potential significant impacts involved, this proposal could be a candidate for referral to the CEQ.

Draft EISs

ERP No. D-FHW-D40275-PA Rating EC2, Kittanning By-Pass/PA-6028, Section 015 Extension of the Allegheny Valley Expressway, existing Allegheny Valley Expressway to the Traffic Route 28/66 and Traffic Route 85 Intersection, Funding and COE Section 404 and EPA NPDES Permits Issuance, Armstrong County, PA.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental concerns for potential impacts to wetlands, terrestrial habitat, and residences. EPA found alternative C Prime to be the environmentally preferable alternative because of its minimization of impacts to wetland resources.

ERP No. D-FRC-D29000-VA Rating EC2, Gaston and Roanoke Rapids Project (FERC-No. 2009-003), Nonpoint Use of Project Lands and Water for the City of Virginia Beach Water Supply Project, License Issuance, Brunswick County, VA.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental concerns with the water demand, as well as potential supply alternatives and requested additional information. EPA also requested water quality modeling of the lower Roanoke River prior to issuance of the final EIS, and FERC convene a session of key parties to develop an appropriate 6-10 year interim withdrawal allocation.

ERP No. D-FRC-K02008-CA Rating EC2, Mojave Natural Gas Pipeline Northward Expansion Project, Construction and Operation, Approvals and Permits Issuance, San Joaquin Valley, San Francisco Bay Area and Sacramento, CA.

Summary: EPA expressed environmental concerns over potential impacts to wetlands, as well as potential significant emissions during construction that may not meet Clean Air Act conformity provisions.

Final EISs

ERP No. F-IBR-J31023-UT Narrows Multi-Purpose Water Development Project, Construction and Operation, Funding, Gooseberry Creek, Manti-La Sal National Forest, Sanpete County, UT.

Summary: EPA continued to have environmental concerns about wetlands impacts, endangered species and the limited alternatives analyzed in the EIS.

ERP No. FS-COE-E30032-FL Palm Beach County Beach Erosion Project, Updated Information, Shore Protection Project, Jupiter/Carlin Segment from